

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

ALONZO JAMICHAEL SEVERSON,

CASE NO. 2:25-cv-00992-JHC

Plaintiff,

ORDER

V.

DONALD J TRUMP ET AL.,

Defendants.

This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff Alonzo Jamichael Severson's motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis (IFP), Dkt. # 1, and sua sponte. The Court GRANTS Severson's motion for leave to proceed IFP.

A complaint filed by a plaintiff proceeding IFP is subject to a mandatory *sua sponte* review and the court “shall dismiss the case at any time if the court determines that . . . the action or appeal—(i) is frivolous or malicious; (ii) fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted; or (iii) seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief.” 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B); *see Calhoun v. Stahl*, 254 F.3d 845 (9th Cir. 2001) (“[T]he provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) are not limited to prisoners.”).

1 Severson's complaint is essentially a copy of his complaint in a prior case that was
2 dismissed with prejudice. *Compare Severson v. Trump Organization*, 2:24-cv-01748-JLR, at
3 Dkt # 5 (W.D. Wash. Oct. 29, 2024), *with* Dkt. # 1-1. The only difference is that he has changed
4 the relief sought from five billion dollars to \$35,100,000,000.¹ “[A]n IFP complaint ‘that merely
5 repeats pending or previously litigated claims’ is subject to dismissal as frivolous.” *Baize v.*
6 *Austin*, 2016 WL 4127803, at *2 (S.D. Cal. Aug. 3, 2016) (citing *Cato v. United States*, 70 F.3d
7 1103, 1105 n.2 (9th Cir. 1995)).

8 Thus, the Court DISMISSES Severson's complaint with prejudice under 28 U.S.C.
9 § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i).

10 Dated this 30th day of May, 2025.

11
12 
13

14 John H. Chun
15 United States District Judge
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24¹ He also adds a new Defendant, “New Trump Organization,” but the address for this entity is the same as the address for “The Trump Organization.” Dkt. # 1-1 at 3.